## Interview Summary

(1) THOMAS H. PARSONS.

Date of Interview: 03 November 2008.

(2) Pat Ryan.

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/595,365
 NATHAN ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 THOMAS H. PARSONS
 1795

(3) Anat Rosenweig; Sanford Colb.

(4)Nathan Menachem.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☑ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☑ applicant's	representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description:	
Claim(s) discussed: <u>All</u> .	
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>US 6,197,450 (Nathan et al.)</u> .	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not rea	ched. h)□ N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what veached, or any other comments: Discussed the unobviousness of using M storage device in view of the fact that prior to the invention MCPs were use detection but not in any art analogous to the claimed electrical storage devo of the prior art. Arguments presented overcame the rejection of record.	ICPs in the claimed electrical energy and in the art of radiation and electron
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amenallowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST II INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONT INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMM FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See SURREUMENTS OF THE SET OF	n has already been filed, APPLICANT IS H OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS IARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office	
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03) Interview Summary	Paper No. 20081210